

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandris, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/816,239	04/01/2004	Jeffery W. Janzen	MICS:0103 (02-1327)	9165		
52142 7590 12/06/2007 FLETCHER YODER (MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.)			EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 692289			RAHMAN, FAHMIDA			
HOUSTON, T	X 77269-2289	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			2116	2116		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			12/06/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

BH
MX
11/

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
10/816,239	JANZEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	_
Fahmida Rahman	2116	

	Fahmida Rahman	2116	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 13 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
 \(\) \text{The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complian time periods: 	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, a stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply r	of Appeal. To avoid abandonment offidavit, or other evidence, which of compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; of	or (3
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 		h in the final rejection, whichever is la	ter I
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire! Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mail (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TI	ing date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhaust of the date for purposes of the period of exhaust of the set forth in (a) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office are may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 dension and the corresponding amour shortened statutory period for reply or r than three months after the mailing of	nt of the fee. The appropriate extension iginally set in the final Office action; or	on fee r (2) a
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extended a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS.	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)).	to avoid dismissal of the appeal.	ate o Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	ef, will not be entered because	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	onsideration and/or search (see N	OTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	ow);		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)) 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	104 CHerbert Nation of Non (Compliant Amondment (PTOL 324	• • •
		Compliant Amendment (F 101-32-	·).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).): Illowable if submitted in a separate	e, timely filed amendment canceli	ng th
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro	will not be entered, or b)	will be entered and an explanation	of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-32</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the affid	avit or other evidence is necessar	y an
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app ry and was not earlier presented.	peal and/or appellant fails to providuse 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	de a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attached.	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b See Note below.	ut does NOT place the application	n in condition for allowance becau	se:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	- (-)	
13. Other:		PRIMARY EXAMINER	

NOTE: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:
Although applicant argues about the interpretations of "manufacturing lot specific" and "bit", these are not defined in specification. Trick teaches reserved space for each IMM. Any information stored there is specific to that IMM, or lot, since that reserved space is programmed by the purchaser or manufacture. Abrahams teaches a lot (101), where non-voltatile memories store component specific currents (Fig 1). If there are 9 components, at least 9 currents are stored. Trick uses one non-volatile memory and reserved space, which can be used to store the operating currents. Therefore, with the combined teaching of Trick and Abrahams, one ordinary skill will be able to provide a non-volatile memory that comprises all the operating currents of the volatile memories of the corresponding lot. These current values are unique to the lot in the sense that currents will differ for different number of volatile memory devices in the lot. If 10 volatile memory devices are in the lot, 10 currents will be stored. That is how they are lot specific.

Applicant argues that currents in Trick and Abrahams may be component type specific, or may comprise industry standard values. However, such arguments are irrelevant because claims only require currents to be unique to lot, no matter how it is unique to the lot. However, such arguments are unique to the lot, as number of components present in the lot defines the currents values stored in the non-volatile memory.

Applicant further argues about application 11/338155. Such arguments are not relevant because scope of the claims are not identical.